



Report 03.294
Date 4 June 2003
File X/13/08/03

Committee Environment Committee
Author Rylee Pettersson Hazard Analyst

Stakeholder Needs Analysis Project: Hazard Information

1. Purpose

To advise the Committee of a Stakeholder Needs Analysis project for hazards information, carried out during 2002/2003.

2. Background

The Stakeholder Needs Analysis project was developed to:

- review the effectiveness of the hazard information that has been collected and distributed during the last decade;
- identify possible future information needs; and
- identify the most useful ways of making the information available to the many agencies, organisations and individuals that use it.

In the past, the main focus has been on gathering technical information on the hazards that are present in the greater Wellington Region.

Consequently, GWRC now has a wide technical knowledge on the hazards that affect the Region, and has many technical reports to support this. We feel that we have now investigated most of the natural and technological hazards that affect the Region.

The focus is now shifting to finding ways to effectively apply the technical knowledge that we have, and make it more user-friendly, understandable and accessible to all of our stakeholders.

3. Objectives

The objectives of the project were to:

- make contact with and meet our stakeholders in the Region;

- find out their hazard and emergency management information needs; and
- discover if we are currently meeting these needs.

We also wanted to assess whether our stakeholders were fully aware of the role that GWRC plays in providing information (such as reports, maps and fact sheets). Feedback was also sought about whether people believe our information is user-friendly, presented in a useful format and is studied at an appropriate scale.

The feedback that we have received will ultimately define a path for GWRC to formulate work and research programmes and to help with the way we format and market our information for the future.

4. Who did we talk to?

We wanted to meet or make contact with as many of our stakeholders as possible, as every group has different needs, views and opinions.

4.1 Territorial authorities

Discussions with the territorial authorities involved talking with staff from emergency management, consents, engineering and planning. Meetings were held at the offices of the each of the territorial authorities.

4.2 Workshops for utility companies and related professionals, and emergency services.

Workshops were held at the GWRC offices. Discussions were held on a series of topics, including the format, scale, scope, cost, currency of our information and access to it.

4.3 Community telephone survey and focus groups

UMR Research were commissioned to survey a sample of the Region's population via a 15 minute telephone survey. Five hundred people were surveyed from Kapiti, Porirua, Upper Hutt, Lower Hutt, Wairarapa and Wellington.

The focus groups are designed to provide a more in-depth analysis. This work is still in progress, and we expect to receive the report in July. UMR will be recruiting candidates for two focus groups from Porirua (with school age children) and Wellington/Hutt Valley (home owners).

5. What were the overall findings?

The project has found that every stakeholder group uses our information for different purposes and at different scales. Refer to attachment one of this report for a summary of the findings.

In general, we found that:

- **Territorial authorities** use the information to educate their stakeholders and for use in their district plans. The territorial authorities prefer local scale information.
- **Utility companies and related professionals** use the information for locating services. This group prefer to receive information on a regional scale.
- **Emergency services** use the information to help with their operations. Emergency services require regional scale information.
- **The general public** use the information to become more prepared for and resilient to hazard events. They also like to receive the information so they can be aware of the hazards. Both local and regional scale information is relevant to this group.

Few people were aware of any or all of the hazard information that we hold. However, those organisations and individuals that had cause to use the information, rated it as excellent.

6. Concluding comment

The feedback received from this project will now be used to ensure we market our information more widely and effectively. We have already started to do this, for example, by setting up targeted electronic mailing lists for disseminating our *Hazards Update* newsletter and our hazard fact sheet series.

7. Recommendations

It is recommended that the Committee:

1. *receive the report; and*
2. *note the contents.*

Report prepared by:

Report approved by:

Report approved by:

Rylee Pettersson
Hazard Analyst

Nicola Shorten
Manager, Resource Policy

Jane Bradbury
Divisional Manager,
Environment